

REMARKS

Claims 1-7 are pending in this application.

It is gratefully acknowledged that the Examiner has withdrawn his prior §103(a) rejection based on the argument regarding the cited references of Peng (Pub. No.: US 2002/0197965) in view of Curtis et al. (U.S. Patent No.: 6,594,472), and that the Examiner finds Claims 6 and 7 to be allowable if rewritten to include the subject matter of the base claim and any intervening claims. The Examiner rejected Claims 1-5 based on newly cited art, as follows: Claims 1-5 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Slipy et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,848,152) in view of Hansen et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,370,362). Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

With respect to the §103(a) rejection of Claim 1, the Examiner states that Slipy et al. teaches a replaceable sliding cover for a folder type phone having all the elements of Claims 1-5, except for a sliding cover for a mobile phone, which is allegedly taught by Hansen et al. In contrast to Claim 1, Slipy et al. teaches a flip type phone having a replaceable faceplate, particularly shown in Figs. 20 and 21. The flip (or moveable element 1802 in Figs. 20 and 21) is not provided with any cover, much less a replaceable sliding cover as claimed in Claim 1. In addition, as seen in Figs. 20 and 21, the replaceable faceplate is snap-fit onto the body of the phone, and is not slidably replaceable by having a raised edge to mate with a slot on the main body. Furthermore, while Hansen et al. may teach a sliding cover 5 for a bar type phone, the sliding cover 5 only covers keypad 8, and is not replaceable. The cover 5 of Hansen et al., when combined with Slipy et al., does not provide a slot formed around the periphery of the folder, nor does it provide a raised edge for mating with the slot. The cover 5 of Hansen et al. provides a movable track system, and merely slides to expose or cover the keypad of the phone, much the same was as a conventional slide-type phone operates. The combination of Slipy et al. and Hansen et al. fails to teach or suggest the replaceable sliding cover of Claim 1.

Accordingly, neither Slipy et al. nor Hansen et al. teach a replaceable sliding cover for a folder-type phone having a slot formed around the periphery of the folder to cover the upper

portion of a folder, as claimed in Claim 1. Withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 1 is respectfully requested.

Claims 2-7 depend from independent Claim 1. As such, dependent Claims 2-7 should also be in condition for allowance.

In view of the preceding remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all pending claims, namely, Claims 1-7, are in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference or personal interview would facilitate resolution of any remaining matters, the Examiner may contact Applicants' attorney at the number given below.

Respectfully submitted,



Paul J. Farrell
Reg. No. 33,494
Attorney for Applicant(s)

DILWORTH & BARRESE, LLP
333 Earle Ovington Blvd.
Uniondale, New York 11553
Tel: (516) 228-8484
Fax: (516) 228-8516

PJF/JWK:las